arXiv:1201.5325v1 [math.AP] 25 Jan 2012

FADING ABSORPTION IN NON-LINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

MOSHE MARCUS AND ANDREY SHISHKOV

Abstract. We study the equation $-\Delta u + h(x)|u|^{q-1}u = 0$, $q > 1$, in $\mathbb{R}^N_+ = \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ where $h \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^N_+})$, $h \geq 0$. Let $(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ be a coordinate system such that $\mathbb{R}^N_+ = [x_N > 0]$ and denote a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ by (x', x_N). Assume that $h(x', x_N) > 0$ when $x' \neq 0$ but $h(x', x_N) \to 0$ as $|x'| \to 0$. For this class of equations we obtain sharp necessary and sufficient conditions in order that singularities on the boundary do not propagate in the interior.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study solutions of the equation

$$-\Delta u + h(x)|u|^{q-1}u = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

in $\mathbb{R}^N_+ = \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ where $q > 1$ and $h \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^N_+})$, $h \geq 0$. (If $x \in \mathbb{R}^N_+$ we write $x = (x', x_N)$ where $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{N-1})$.)

If $h > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$ then boundary singularities of solutions of (1.1) cannot propagate to the interior. This is due to the presence of the absorption term $h|u|^{q-1}u$ and the Keller – Osserman estimates, [3] and [7]. In fact, in this case, (1.1) possesses a maximal solution U in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$ and,

$$\lim_{\substack{x_N \to 0 \\ |x| \leq M}} U(x) = \infty \quad \forall M > 0. \tag{1.2}$$

A solution satisfying this boundary condition is called a *large solution*. It is known that under these conditions the large solution is unique (see e.g. [1]).

On the other hand, if h vanishes on a set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^N_+$ which has limit points on $[x_N = 0]$ then a singularity at these limit points may propagate to the interior. By this we mean that there may exist a sequence $\{u_n\}$ of solutions of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$ which converges in

$$\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N_+ \setminus F$$

but tends to infinity at some points of F.

In this paper we shall study the case where h is positive in Ω but may vanish on

$$F = \{(0, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N_+ : x_N > 0\}.$$

Date: January 26, 2012.

This research was supported by The Israel Science Foundation grant No. 91/10.

Since h is positive in $\mathbb{R}^N_+ \setminus F$ a singularity at the origin may propagate only along the set F. Furthermore a weak singularity, such as that of the Poisson kernel, cannot propagate to the interior because any solution of (1.1) is dominated by the harmonic function with the same boundary behavior. Therefore we must consider only strong singularities, i.e. singularities which cannot occur in the case of a harmonic function but may occur with respect to solutions of (1.1).

Suppose that

$$h(x', x_N) \le h_0(|x'|),$$

where

$$h_0 \in C^1[0,\infty), \quad h_0(s) > 0 \text{ for } s > 0, \quad h_0(0) = 0.$$

It is clear that, the faster $h_0(s)$ tends to zero as $s \to 0$ the greater the chance that a strong boundary singularity at the origin will propagate to the interior.

Our aim is to determine a sharp criterion for the propagation of singularities with respect to solutions of (1.1) with $h \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^N_+})$ such that $h > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N_+ \setminus F$. It turns out that such a criterion can be expressed in terms of functions of the form

$$\bar{h}(s) := e^{-\frac{\omega(s)}{s}}. \tag{1.3}$$

We assume that ω satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} &(i) \quad \omega \in C(0,\infty) \quad \text{is a positive nondecreasing function,} \\ &(ii) \quad s \mapsto \mu(s) := \frac{\omega(s)}{s} \text{ is monotone decreasing on } \mathbb{R}_+, \\ &(iii) \quad \lim_{s\to 0} \mu(s) = \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

We establish the following results.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that*

$$\liminf_{\substack{x\to 0\\ x'\neq 0}} h(x)/\bar{h}(|x'|) > 0 \tag{1.5}$$

where $\bar{h}$ *is given by* (1.3) *and that* (1.4) *holds.*

Suppose that ω *satisfies the Dini condition,*

$$\int_0^1 (\omega(t)/t)\, dt < \infty. \tag{1.6}$$

If $\{u_n\}$ *is a sequence of solutions of* (1.1) *in* $\mathbb{R}^N_+$ *converging (pointwise) in*

$$\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N_+ \setminus F$$

then the sequence converges in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$ *and its limit is a solution of* (1.1) *in* $\mathbb{R}^N_+$.

In particular, (1.1) *possesses a maximal solution* U *in* $\mathbb{R}^N_+$.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that there exists a constant* $c > 0$ *such that*

$$h(x) \leq c\,\bar{h}(|x'|) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N_+ \tag{1.7}$$

where $\bar{h}$ *is given by* (1.3)*. Assume that* (1.4) *and the following additional conditions hold:*

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} \frac{\mu(a^{-j+1})}{\mu(a^{-j})} < 1 \quad \textit{for some } a > 1 \tag{1.8}$$

and

$$\lim_{s\to 0} \mu(s)/|\ln s| = \infty. \tag{1.9}$$

Condition (1.9) *guarantees that, for every real* k, (1.1) *has a solution* $u_{0,k}$ *with boundary data* $k\delta_0$ *(where* δ_0 *denotes the Dirac measure at the origin).*

Under these assumptions, if

$$\int_0^1 (\omega(t)/t)\,dt = \infty \tag{1.10}$$

then

$$u_{0,\infty} = \lim u_{0,k} \tag{1.11}$$

is a solution of (1.1) *in* Ω *but*

$$u_{0,\infty}(x) = \infty \quad \forall x \in F.$$

Corollary 1.1. *Suppose that there exists a positive constant* c *such that*

$$c^{-1}\bar{h}(|x'|) \leq h(x) \leq c\bar{h}(|x'|) \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^N_+} \tag{1.12}$$

where $\bar{h}$ *is given by* (1.3) *and satisfies conditions* (1.4)*,* (1.8) *and* (1.9)*. Then the Dini condition* (1.6) *is necessary and sufficient for the existence of a large solution of* (1.1) *in* $\mathbb{R}^N_+$*. It is also necessary and sufficient for the existence of the strongly singular solution* $u_{0,\infty}$*.*

Problems concerning the propagation of singularities for semilinear equations with absorption have been studied in [5], [8] (parabolic case) and in [6], [9] (elliptic case). However, in these papers it was assumed that the absorption term is positive everywhere in the interior of the domain, fading only at the initial time or on the spatial boundary. Consequently singularities could propagate only along $t = 0$ or along the boundary.

In [5] the authors studied the equation

$$\partial_t u - \Delta u + e^{-\frac{1}{t}} u^q = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}_+$$

and proved that if u is a positive solution with strong singularity at a point on $t = 0$ then u blows up at every point of the initial plane. In [6] the authors studied the corresponding elliptic problem in a domain D where the coefficient of the absorption term is $e^{-\frac{1}{\rho(x)}}$, $\rho(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$, proving a similar result.

In [8] the authors considered the equation,

$$\partial_t u - \Delta u + e^{-\frac{\omega(t)}{t}} u^q = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}_+$$

where ω is a positive, continuous and increasing function on $\mathbb{R}_+$. They proved that if $\sqrt{\omega}$ satisfies the Dini condition then there exist solutions with a strong isolated singularity at a point on $t = 0$. Similar sufficient conditions were obtained in [9] and [10] with respect to an elliptic (respectively parabolic) equation where the absorption term vanishes at the boundary (respectively at $x = 0$).

The methods of the present paper can be applied to these and other problems with fading absorption, to obtain sharp necessary and sufficient conditions for the propagation of singularities.

Acknowledgment. AS wishes to thank the Department of Mathematics at the Technion for its hospitality during his visits.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Given $R > 0$ let $x^R = (0, R)$ and denote by B_R the ball of radius R centered at x^R. We shall prove the following:

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that* $h = \bar{h}$ *in a neighborhood of the origin. Then, under the assumptions Theorem 1.1, there exists* $R > 0$ *such that* (1.1) *has a solution* V^R *in* B_R *which blows up everywhere on the boundary:*

$$V^R(x) \to \infty \quad \textit{as} \quad x \to \partial B_R.$$

Now let v_k denote the solution of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$ such that $v_k = k$ on the boundary and put

$$V = \lim_{k\to\infty} v_k.$$

Condition (1.5) implies that there exist positive constants $\underline{c}$ and $\underline{R}$ such that

$$h(x) \geq \underline{c}\,\bar{h}(|x'|) \quad \text{for} \quad |x| < \underline{R}. \tag{2.1}$$

Therefore Theorem 2.1 implies that there exists $R \in (0, \underline{R}/2)$ such that

$$V \leq V^R.$$

Further this implies that V is locally bounded in the strip $0 < x_N < R$ and therefore, everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$. Finally, since V dominates every solution of (1.1), the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 follows.

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on estimates of certain energy integrals of solutions of (1.1). In a half space these integrals are infinite. Therefore we shall estimate integrals over a bounded domain for solutions with arbitrary large boundary data.

Condition (1.6) implies that $\lim_{s\to 0} \omega(s) = 0$ while (1.4) implies that $\lim_{s\to 0} \bar{h}(s) = 0$. We extend both of these functions to $[0, \infty)$ by setting them equal to zero at the origin.

In the course of the proof we denote by c, c', c_i constants which depend only on N, q. The value of the constant may vary from one formula to another. A notation such as $C(b)$ denotes a constant depending on the parameter b as well as on N, q.

2.1. **Part 1.** Let R, b be positive numbers such that $R/8 < b < R/2$. Denote by U_M, $M > 0$, the solution of (1.1) in $B_R(0)$ such that $U_M = M$ on $\partial B_R(0)$.

Let

$$\Omega_b = \{x = (x', x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x'| < b,\ |x_N| < b\}.$$

We start with an elementary estimate of the energy integral:

$$I_b(M) = \int_{\Omega_b} (|\nabla U_M|^2 + h(x)U_M^{q+1})\, dx. \tag{2.2}$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let h be as in* (1.3) *and assume* (1.4). *Then*

$$I_b(M) \leq C_1(b)M^{q+1}, \quad C_1(b) = cb^N\bar{h}(8b). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Let $v_M := U_M - M$. Multiplying (1.1) (for $u = U_M$) by v_M and integrating by parts we obtain,

$$\int_{B_R(0)} (|\nabla U_M|^2 + h(x)U_M^q v_M)dx = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} I_b(M) \leq & \int_{B_R(0)} (|\nabla U_M|^2 + h(x)U_M^{q+1})dx \\ =& M\int_{B_R(0)} h(x)U_M^q dx \leq c'M^{q+1}\bar{h}(R)R^N \leq cb^N\bar{h}(8b)M^{q+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

□

Notation. Put

$$\Omega_b(s) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : s < |x'| < b - s,\ |x_N| < b - s\} \quad \forall\, s \in (0, b/2). \tag{2.5}$$

If v is a positive solution of (1.1) in $B_R(0)$, denote

$$J_b(s; v) := \int_{\Omega_b(s)} (|\nabla_x v|^2 + \bar{h}(|x'|)v^{q+1})dx. \tag{2.6}$$

Finally denote,

$$\varphi_b(s) := \int_{\partial\Omega_b(s)} h(x)^{-\frac{2}{q-1}} d\sigma. \tag{2.7}$$

Proposition 2.1. *There exists a constant c such that, for every positive solution v of* (1.1) *in $B_R(0)$,*

$$J_b(s; v) \leq c\Big(\int_0^s \varphi_b(r)^{-\frac{q-1}{q+3}}dr\Big)^{-\frac{q+3}{q-1}} \quad \forall\, s \in (0, b/2). \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. Put $S_b(s) := \partial\Omega_b(s)$ and denote by $\vec{n} = \vec{n}(x)$ the unit outward normal to $S_b(s)$ at x.

Multiplying equation (1.1) by v and integrating by parts over $\Omega_b(s)$ we obtain,

$$\int_{\Omega_b(s)} (|\nabla_x v|^2 + \bar{h}(|x'|)v^{q+1})dx = \int_{S_b(s)} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{n}} v d\sigma, \tag{2.9}$$

We estimate the term on the right-hand side using first Hölder's inequality (for a product of three terms) and secondly Young's inequality:

$$\begin{gathered} \left| \int_{S_b(s)} v \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{n}} d\sigma \right| \leq \int_{S_b(s)} |\nabla_x v||v| d\sigma \leq \\ \left(\int_{S_b(s)} |\nabla_x v|^2 d\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{S_b(s)} h(x)|v|^{q+1} d\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{q+1}} \varphi_b(s)^{\frac{q-1}{2(q+1)}} \leq \\ c_1 \left(\int_{S_b(s)} (|\nabla_x v|^2 + h(x)v^{q+1}) d\sigma \right)^{\frac{q+3}{2(q+1)}} \varphi_b(s)^{\frac{q-1}{2(q+1)}}. \end{gathered} \tag{2.10}$$

Substituting estimate (2.10) into (2.9) we obtain:

$$J_b(s;v) \quad \leq \quad c_2 \left(\int_{S_b(s)} (|\nabla_x v|^2 \ + \ h(x)v^{q+1}) d\sigma \right)^{\frac{q+3}{2(q+1)}} \varphi_b(s)^{\frac{q-1}{2(q+1)}}. \tag{2.11}$$

Since

$$-\frac{d}{ds} J_b(s;v) = \int_{S_b(s)} (|\nabla_x v|^2 + h(x)v^{q+1}) d\sigma,$$

inequality (2.11) is equivalent to

$$J_b(s;v) \leq c_3 \varphi_b(s)^{\frac{q-1}{2(q+1)}} \Big(-\frac{d}{ds} J_b(s;v) \Big)^{\frac{q+3}{2(q+1)}} \qquad \forall\, s \in (0, b/2).$$

Solving this differential inequality, with initial data $J_b(b/2; v) = 0$, we obtain (2.8). □

In continuation we derive a more explicit estimate for h as in (1.3). We need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $A > 0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and let $\omega \in C^1(0,\infty)$ be a positive function satisfying condition (1.4). Then there exist $\bar{s} \in (0,1)$, depending on A, l and ω such that the following inequality holds:*

$$\int_0^s t^{m-1} \omega(t)^l \exp\Big(-A\mu(t) \Big) dt \geq \frac{s^{m+1}\omega(s)^{l-1}}{(m+1)\mu(s)^{-1} + A} \exp(-A\mu(s)) \qquad \forall s : 0 < s < \bar{s}. \tag{2.12}$$

Proof. Due to condition (1.4) (ii) integration by parts yields:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^s t^m\omega(t)^l\exp(-A\mu(t))dt\\ =&\frac{s^{m+1}}{m+1}\omega(s)^l\exp(-A\mu(s))-\int_0^s\frac{At^{m-1}}{m+1}\exp(-A\mu(t))\omega(t)^{l+1}dt\\ +&\int_0^s\frac{t^{m+1}}{m+1}\exp(-A\mu(t))\omega'(t)\omega^{l-1}(A\mu(t)-l)dt.\end{aligned}\tag{2.13}$$

Again due to (1.4) (ii), there exists $\bar{s}>0$ such that

$$A\mu(s)\ge l\quad\forall s\in(0,\bar{s}).$$

For later estimates it is convenient to choose $\bar{s}$ in $(0,1)$.

As $\omega(s)$ is non-decreasing, it follows that, for $0<s\le\bar{s}$,

$$\Big(s+\frac{A\omega(s)}{m+1}\Big)\int_0^s t^{m-1}\omega(t)^l\exp(-A\mu(t))dt\ \ge\ \frac{s^{m+1}}{m+1}\omega(s)^l\exp(-A\mu(s)).$$

This inequality is equivalent to (2.12). □

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that* h *is given by* (1.3) *and satisfies* (1.4)*. Then there exists a constant* $s^*\in(0,b/2)$*, depending on* N,q *and the rate of blow-up of* $\mu(s)=\omega(s)/s$ *as* $s\to0$*, such that*

$$\begin{aligned}&J_b(s;v)\le cb^{N-1}\exp Q(s)\quad\forall s\in(0,s^*)\\ &Q(s)=\frac{2\mu(s)}{q-1}+\frac{q+3}{q-1}\ln\mu(s)-\frac{q+3}{q-1}\ln s,\end{aligned}\tag{2.14}$$

for every positive solution v *of* (1.1) *in* $B_R(0)$.

If, in addition, there exists a positive constant β *such that*

$$\beta\ln\frac{1}{s}\le\mu(s)\quad 0<s\le s^*,\tag{2.15}$$

then

$$Q(s)\le Q_0\mu(s)\quad 0<s\le s^*\tag{2.16}$$

where

$$Q_0:=\frac{2}{q-1}+\frac{q+3}{(q-1)}+\frac{q+3}{\beta(q-1)}.\tag{2.17}$$

Proof. Denote

$$S_{b,1}(s)=\{x:|x'|=s,\ |x_N|<b\}\cup\{x:|x'|=b-s,\ |x_N|<b\}$$

and

$$S_{b,2}(s)=\{x:s<|x'|<b-s,\ |x_N|=b\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{S_{b,1}} \bar{h}(|x'|)^{-\frac{2}{q-1}}d\sigma \\ &= 2\gamma_{N-1}(b-s)(\bar{h}(s)^{-\frac{2}{q-1}}s^{N-2} + \bar{h}(b)^{-\frac{2}{q-1}}(b-s)^{N-2}) \\ &\leq 4b^{N-1}\gamma_{N-1}\exp\frac{2\mu(s)}{q-1} \qquad 0<s<b/2,\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

where γ_{N-1} denotes the area of the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$. Further, since μ is monotone decreasing,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{S_{b,2}} \bar{h}(|x'|)^{-\frac{2}{q-1}}d\sigma &= 2\gamma_{N-1}\int_s^{b-s}\exp\frac{2\mu(\rho)}{q-1}\rho^{N-2}d\rho \\ &\leq 2(N-1)^{-1}b^{N-1}\gamma_{N-1}\exp\frac{2\mu(s)}{q-1}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

By (2.18) and (2.19):

$$\varphi_b(s) = \int_{S_b(s)} \bar{h}(|x'|)^{-\frac{2}{q-1}}d\sigma \leq cb^{N-1}\exp\frac{2\mu(s)}{q-1}, \quad 0<s<b/2,$$

where $c = (4+2(N-1)^{-1})\gamma_{N-1}$. This implies,

$$\int_0^s \varphi_b(r)^{-\frac{q-1}{q+3}}dr \geq c_1 b^{-\frac{(N-1)(q-1)}{q+3}}\int_0^s \exp\Big(-\frac{2\mu(r)}{q+3}\Big)dr, \quad c_1 = c^{-\frac{q-1}{q+3}}. \tag{2.20}$$

Let s^* be the largest number in $(0,b/2)$ such that

◇ $s^* \leq \bar{s}$, ($\bar{s}$ as in Lemma 2.2 for $l=0$, $m=1$ and $A = \dfrac{2}{q+3}$),

◇ $\mu(s^*) \geq A^{-1} = (q+3)/2$.

Then (2.20) and (2.12) imply

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^s \varphi_b(r)^{-\frac{q-1}{q+3}}dr &\geq c_2 b^{-\frac{(N-1)(q-1)}{q+3}}\frac{s^2}{\omega(s)}\exp\Big(-\frac{2\mu(s)}{q+3}\Big), \\ c_2 &= c_1(q+3)/6,\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

for all $s \in (0,s^*]$. This inequality and (2.8) imply (2.14).

Suppose now that the function $\mu(\cdot)$ given by (1.3) satisfies (2.15). Since $\ln r \leq r$ for $r \geq 1$, conditions (1.4), (2.14) and (2.15) imply (2.16). □

Next we estimate energy integrals over domains of the form

$$\Omega_b(\tau,\sigma) := \{x=(x',x_N) : |x'|<\sigma,\ |x_N|<b-\tau\} \tag{2.22}$$

where $0<\sigma<b/2$, $0\leq\tau<b$.

Let $\eta \in C^\infty([0,\infty))$ be a monotone decreasing function such that

$$\eta(s) = 1 \text{ if } s<1,\ \eta(s)=0 \text{ if } s>2,\ \eta'(s)\leq 2 \tag{2.23}$$

and denote

$$\eta_\sigma(s) = \eta(s/\sigma).$$

We shall estimate the integrals,

$$E_b(\tau,\sigma;v) := \int_{\Omega_b(\tau,2\sigma)} \Big(\big|\nabla_x\big(\eta_\sigma(|x'|)v\big)\big|^2 + h(x)\eta_\sigma(|x'|)^2 v^{q+1}\Big)\,dx. \tag{2.24}$$

Proposition 2.3. *Assume condition* (1.4). *Let* $s^* \in (0, b/2)$ *be as in Proposition 2.2. Then the following inequality holds for* $0 < \sigma \le s^*$ *and* $\sigma \le \tau < b$*:*

$$E_b(\tau,\sigma;v) \le c\,\sigma\Big(-\frac{dE_b(\tau,\sigma;v)}{d\tau}\Big) + C_2(b)\exp H(\sigma), \tag{2.25}$$

where $C_2(b) := cb^{\frac{2(N-1)}{q+1}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\sigma) &= 2\frac{Q(\sigma)+\mu(\sigma)}{q+1} + \frac{(N-1)(q-1)-2(q+1)}{q+1}\ln\sigma \\ &= \frac{2\mu(\sigma)}{q-1} + \frac{2(q+3)}{q^2-1}\ln\mu(\sigma) - c_+^*\ln\sigma \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

and

$$c^* = \frac{2(q+3)+2(q^2-1)-(N-1)(q-1)^2}{q^2-1}.$$

If, in addition, condition (2.15) *holds then there exists a constant* H_0 *depending only on* q *and* β *such that*

$$H(\sigma) \le H_0\mu(\sigma), \tag{2.27}$$

where

$$H_0 = \frac{2}{q-1} + \frac{2(q+3)}{(q-1)(q+1)} + \frac{c_+^*}{\beta}. \tag{2.28}$$

Proof. Multiplying equation (1.1) by $\eta_\sigma(|x'|)^2 v$ and integrating by parts over $\Omega_b(\tau,2\sigma)$ we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_b(\tau,2\sigma)} \nabla v\cdot\nabla(v\eta_\sigma^2)dx + &\int_{\Omega_b(\tau,2\sigma)} h(x)v^{q+1}\eta_\sigma^2 dx \\ &= \int_{S_b'(\tau,2\sigma)} \frac{\partial v}{\partial\vec{n}} v\eta_\sigma^2 dx', \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

where $S_b'(\tau,\sigma) = \{x : |x'| < \sigma,\ |x_N| = b-\tau\}$.

We estimate the first term on the left hand side:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega_b(\tau,2\sigma)} \nabla v\cdot\nabla(v\eta_\sigma^2)dx = \\ &\int_{\Omega_b(\tau,2\sigma)} |\nabla(v\eta_\sigma)|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_b(\tau,2\sigma)} v^2\,|\nabla\eta_\sigma|^2\,dx \ge \\ &\int_{\Omega_b(\tau,2\sigma)} |\nabla(v\eta_\sigma)|^2 dx - 4\sigma^{-2}\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_b(\tau,\sigma)} v^2 dx, \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

where

$$\tilde{\Omega}_b(\tau,\sigma) := \{\sigma < |x'| < 2\sigma,\ |x_N| < b-\tau\}. \tag{2.31}$$

Using Hölder's inequality, conditions (1.3), (1.4) and estimate (2.14) with $s=\sigma$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_b(\tau,\sigma)} v(x)^2 dx \leq \\
&\Big(\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_b(\tau,\sigma)} v^{q+1} h(x) dx\Big)^{\frac{2}{q+1}} \Big(\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_b(\tau,\sigma)} h(x)^{-\frac{2}{q-1}} dx\Big)^{\frac{q-1}{q+1}} \leq \\
&c'(b^{N-1}\exp Q(\sigma))^{\frac{2}{q+1}} \bar{h}(\sigma)^{-\frac{2}{q+1}} \left|\tilde{\Omega}_b(\tau,\sigma)\right|^{\frac{q-1}{q+1}} \leq \\
&cb^{\frac{2(N-1)}{q+1}} \exp\Big(\frac{2Q(\sigma)}{q+1}\Big) \exp\Big(\frac{2\mu(\sigma)}{q+1}\Big) \sigma^{\frac{(N-1)(q-1)}{q+1}}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

for $\sigma < \tau < b$ and $0 < \sigma < \min\{s^*, \frac{b}{3}\}$. The application of (2.14) here is justified because, for τ and σ as above, $\tilde{\Omega}_b(\tau,\sigma) \subset \Omega_b(\sigma)$.

Combining (2.29) – (2.32) we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_b(\tau,2\sigma)} |\nabla(v\eta_\sigma)|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_b(\tau,2\sigma)} h(x) v^{q+1} \eta_\sigma^2 dx \leq \\
&\int_{S'_b(\tau,2\sigma)} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{n}} v\eta_\sigma^2 dx' + cb^{\frac{2(N-1)}{q+1}} \exp\Big(\frac{2(Q(\sigma)+\mu(\sigma))}{q+1}\Big) \sigma^{\frac{(N-1)(q-1)}{q+1}-2},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

Next, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\int_{S'_b(\tau,2\sigma)} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{n}} v\eta_\sigma^2 dx'\Big| &\leq \int_{S'_b(\tau,2\sigma)} \Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial x_N}(v\eta_\sigma(|x'|))\Big| v\eta_\sigma\, dx' \\
&\leq \Big(\int_{S'_b(\tau,2\sigma)} \big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_N}(v\eta_\sigma)\big)^2 dx'\Big)^{1/2} \Big(\int_{S'_b(\tau,2\sigma)} (v\eta_\sigma)^2 dx'\Big)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

and by Poincaré's inequality in $S'_b(\tau,\sigma)$,

$$\int_{S'_b(\tau,2\sigma)} (v\eta_\sigma)^2 dx' \leq (c_0\sigma)^2 \int_{S'_b(\tau,2\sigma)} |\nabla_{x'}(v\eta_\sigma)|^2 dx'.$$

Therefore

$$\Big|\int_{S'_b(\tau,2\sigma)} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{n}} v\eta_\sigma^2 dx'\Big| \leq c\sigma \int_{S'_b(\tau,2\sigma)} |\nabla_x(v\eta_\sigma)|^2 dx'. \tag{2.34}$$

Since

$$\frac{dE_b(\tau,\sigma;v)}{d\tau} = -\int_{S'_b(\tau,2\sigma)} (|\nabla(v\eta_\sigma)|^2 + h(x)v^{q+1}\eta_\sigma^2) dx'.$$

inequalities (2.33) and (2.34) imply (2.25).

Finally, if (2.15) holds, (2.27) is obtained in the same way as (2.16). □

2.2. **Part2.** *Notation.* Given $M > 0$ and $\nu \in (0,1)$, let $s_\nu = s_\nu(M)$ be defined by,

$$\exp(Q_0\mu(s_\nu(M)) = \bar{h}(s_\nu(M))^{-Q_0} = M^\nu, \tag{2.35}$$

where Q_0 is given by (2.17).

Lemma 2.3. *Put*

$$\gamma := \frac{2(q+1+\beta)-(N-1)(q-1)}{\beta Q_0(q+1)}, \tag{2.36}$$

where β is a positive number satisfying (2.15) *and*

$$\nu_0 := \begin{cases} 1 & \textit{if } \gamma \le 0, \\ \frac{q-1}{\gamma} & \textit{if } \gamma > 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.37}$$

If

$$0 < \nu < \min(\nu_0, 1) \tag{2.38}$$

then,

$$E_b(0, s_\nu(M'); U_M) \le 2\big(I_b(M) + C_3(b)M^2 M'^{q-1}\big) \quad 1 \le M' \le M, \tag{2.39}$$

where

$$C_3(b) := cb^{\frac{2N+q-1}{q+1}}\bar{h}(8b)^{\frac{2}{q+1}}. \tag{2.40}$$

Proof. Put

$$I_b'(s,M) := \int_{\Omega_b} U_M^2|\nabla\eta_s|^2dx.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &E_b(0, s_\nu(M'), U_M) \\ &\le 2\int_{\Omega_b}(|\nabla(U_M)|^2\eta_{s_\nu}^2 + h(x)U_M^{q+1}\eta_{s_\nu}^2)dx + 2\int_{\Omega_b}U_M^2|\nabla\eta_{s_\nu}|^2dx \\ &\le 2\big(I_b(M) + I_b'(s_\nu, M)\big), \quad s_\nu = s_\nu(M'). \end{aligned} \tag{2.41}$$

By (2.23), $\nabla\eta_{s_\nu}(|x'|) = 0$ for $|x'| < s_\nu$ and for $|x'| > 2s_\nu$. Therefore, applying Hölder's inequality and using the monotonicity of $\bar{h}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_b'(s_\nu(M'), M) &\le 4s_\nu^{-2}\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_b(0,s_\nu)} U_M^2 dx \\ &\le 4s_\nu^{-2}\Big(\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_b(0,s_\nu)} U_M^{q+1}h\,dx\Big)^{\frac{2}{q+1}}\Big(\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_b(0,s_\nu)}\bar{h}(|x'|)^{\frac{2}{1-q}}dx\Big)^{\frac{q-1}{q+1}} \\ &\le cs_\nu^{-2}(b^N\bar{h}(8b)M^{q+1})^{\frac{2}{q+1}}\bar{h}(s_\nu)^{-\frac{2}{q+1}}s_\nu^{\frac{(N-1)(q-1)}{q+1}}b^{\frac{q-1}{q+1}} \\ &= c(b^N\bar{h}(8b))^{\frac{2}{q+1}}b^{\frac{q-1}{q+1}}M^2 s_\nu^{-2+\frac{(N-1)(q-1)}{q+1}}\exp\frac{2\mu(s_\nu)}{q+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.15) and (2.35)

$$s^{-1} \le \exp(\mu(s)/\beta), \quad M'^{-\nu/Q_0} = \bar{h}(s_\nu) = \exp(-\mu(s_\nu)).$$

Therefore the previous inequality yields

$$I'_b(s_\nu(M'),M) \leq c(b^N \bar{h}(8b))^{\frac{2}{q+1}} b^{\frac{q-1}{q+1}} M^2 M'^{\frac{\nu}{\beta Q_0}(2-\frac{(N-1)(q-1)}{q+1})+\frac{2}{q+1}\frac{\nu}{Q_0}}.$$

Hence

$$I'_b(s_\nu(M'),M) \leq C_3(b) M^2 M'^{\nu\gamma} \tag{2.42}$$

with γ and $C_3(b)$ as in (2.36) and (2.40). By (2.38) $\nu\gamma \leq q-1$. Therefore (2.41) and (2.42) imply (2.39). $\square$

Notation. For every $M > 0$ and $0 \leq s \leq b/2$ denote,

$$T_b(s,M) = \{\tau : \ s \leq \tau < b, \ E_b(\tau, s; U_M) \geq 2C_2(b)\exp(H_0\mu(s))\} \tag{2.43}$$

where $C_2(b)$ is the constant in (2.25) and H_0 is given by (2.28).

Note that $\tau \mapsto E_b(\tau, s; U_M)$ is continuous and non-increasing in the interval $[s,b]$. Therefore, if

$$E_b(s,s;U_M) < 2C_2(b)\exp(H_0\mu(s))$$

then $T_b(s,M) = \emptyset$. Put,

$$\tau_b(s,M) = \begin{cases} s & \text{if } T_b(s,M) = \emptyset, \\ \sup T_b(s,M) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{2.44}$$

and

$$\tau_{b,\nu}(M',M) := \tau_b(s_\nu(M'),M). \tag{2.45}$$

Since $\lim_{\tau \to b} E_b(\tau, s; U_M) \to 0$ it follows that

$$s_\nu(M') \leq \tau_{b,\nu}(M',M) < b. \tag{2.46}$$

Furthermore,

$$E_b(\tau_{b,\nu}(M',M), s_\nu(M'); U_M) \leq 2C_2(b)\exp(H_0\mu(s_\nu(M'))) \tag{2.47}$$

and, if $\tau_{b,\nu}(M',M) > s_\nu(M')$ then,

$$E_b(\tau, s_\nu(M'); U_M) \geq 2C_2(b)\exp(H_0\mu(s_\nu(M'))) \tag{2.48}$$

for every $\tau \in (0, \tau_{b,\nu}(M',M)]$, with equality for $\tau = \tau_{b,\nu}(M',M)$.

Proposition 2.4. (*i*) *Let*

$$b'_\nu(M',M) := b - \tau_{b,\nu}(M',M).$$

Then

$$\int_{\Omega_{b'_\nu(M',M)}} (|\nabla_x U_M|^2 + h(x)U_M^{q+1})dx \leq c_0(b^{N-1}M'^\nu + C_2(b)M'^{\frac{\nu H_0}{Q_0}}). \tag{2.49}$$

(*ii*) *Assume that*

$$0 < \nu \leq \frac{q+1}{4}\min(1, Q_0/H_0). \tag{2.50}$$

where H_0 *is given by* (2.28) *and* Q_0 *is given by* (2.17). *Let* $a \in (1,2)$ *and assume that* M' *is large enough so that,*

$$C_4(b) := c_0(b^{N-1} + C_2(b))/\,C_1(b) \le M'^{(q+1)/2a} \tag{2.51}$$

where $C_1(b)$ *and* $C_2(b)$ *are the constants in Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.3 respectively while* c_0 *is the constant in* (2.49).

Then

$$I_{b'_\nu(M',M)}(M) = \int_{\Omega_{b'_\nu(M',M)}} (|\nabla_x U_M|^2 + h(x)U_M^{q+1})dx \le C_1(b)M'^{\frac{q+1}{a}}. \tag{2.52}$$

Proof. By (2.35),

$$M' = \exp\Big(\frac{Q_0}{\nu}\mu(s_\nu(M'))\Big). \tag{2.53}$$

Therefore, by (2.47),

$$E_b(\tau_{b,\nu}(M',M), s_\nu(M'); U_M) \le 2C_2(b)M'^{\frac{\nu H_0}{Q_0}}. \tag{2.54}$$

By Proposition 2.2 applied to the estimate of $J_b(s_\nu(M'), U_M)$,

$$J_b(s_\nu(M'), U_M) \le cb^{N-1}\exp(Q_0\mu(s_\nu(M')) = cb^{N-1}M'^{\nu}. \tag{2.55}$$

Inequality (2.46) implies that $b'_\nu(M',M) \le b - s_\nu(M')$. Therefore

$$\Omega_{b'_\nu(M',M)} \subset \Omega_b(\tau_{b,\nu}(M',M), s_\nu(M')) \cup \overline{\Omega_b(s_\nu(M'))}$$

(see (2.5) for definition of $\Omega_b(s)$). Consequently

$$I_{b'_\nu(M',M)}(M) \le E_b(\tau_{b,\nu}(M',M), s_\nu(M'); U_M) + J_b(s_\nu(M'), U_M).$$

This inequality together with (2.54) and (2.55) imply (2.49).

In view of (2.50) we have,

$$b^{N-1}M'^{\nu} + C_2(b)M'^{\frac{\nu H_0}{Q_0}} \le (b^{N-1} + C_2(b))M'^{(q+1)/2a}.$$

If M' satisfies (2.51), this inequality and (2.49) imply (2.52). □

Next we derive an upper bound for $\tau_{b,\nu}(M',M)$ in terms of $s_\nu(M')$.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that* $0 < \nu$ *satisfies conditions* (2.38) *and* (2.50) *and that*

$$M \ge \exp\Big(\frac{Q_0}{\nu}\mu(s^*)\Big) \tag{2.56}$$

where s^* *is as in Proposition 2.3. Then*

$$\exp\Big(\frac{\tau_{b,\nu}(M',M)}{2cs_\nu(M')}\Big) \le c_1(I_b(M) + C_3(b)M^2M'^{q-1})C_2(b)^{-1}M'^{-\frac{\nu H_0}{Q_0}}. \tag{2.57}$$

Proof. Since ν satisfies (2.50) and $1 < a < 2$,

$$0 < Q_0(q+1)(1-\frac{1}{2a}) \leq Q_0(q+1) - H_0\nu.$$

By (2.39),

$$\begin{aligned} &E_b(\tau, s_\nu(M'); M) \leq \\ &E_b(0, s_\nu(M'); M) \leq 2\big(I_b(M) + C_3(b)M^2M'^{q-1}\big) \qquad \forall\tau \in (0,b) \end{aligned} \tag{2.58}$$

where $1 < M' < M$.

If $\tau_{b,\nu} \leqslant s_\nu$ inequality (2.57) is trivial. Therefore we may assume that

$$\tau_{b,\nu}(M', M) > s_\nu(M').$$

Temporarily denote

$$F(\tau) = E_b(\tau, s_\nu(M'); M).$$

By Proposition 2.3, (2.56) and (2.48),

$$F(\tau) \leq 2cs_\nu(M')\Big(-\frac{dF(\tau)}{d\tau}\Big) \quad \forall\tau : s_\nu(M') < \tau < \tau_{b,\nu}(M', M). \tag{2.59}$$

Solving this differential inequality with initial condition $F(s_\nu(M'))$ satisfying (2.58) we obtain,

$$E_b(\tau, s_\nu(M'); M) \leq c_1(I_b(M) + C_3(b)M^2M'^{q-1})\exp\Big(-\frac{\tau}{2cs_\nu}\Big) \tag{2.60}$$

for every $\tau \in [s_\nu(M'), \tau_{b,\nu}(M', M)]$. Combining (2.60) and (2.48) for $\tau = \tau_{b,\nu}(M', M)$ (in which case (2.48) holds with equality) we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} &2C_2(b)\exp(H_0\mu(s_\nu(M'))) \\ &\leq c_1(I_b(M) + C_3(b)M^2M'^{q-1})\exp\Big(-\frac{\tau_{b,\nu}(M', M)}{2cs_\nu(M')}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.53) this inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp\Big(\frac{\tau_{b,\nu}(M', M)}{2cs_\nu(M')}\Big) \leq \\ &c_1(I_b(M) + C_3(b)M^2M'^{q-1})C_2(b)^{-1}\exp(-H_0\mu(s_\nu(M'))) = \\ &c_1(I_b(M) + C_3(b)M^2M'^{q-1})C_2(b)^{-1}M'^{-\frac{\nu H_0}{Q_0}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.61}$$

□

2.3. **Part 3.** In this part of the proof we apply the previous estimates to a specific sequence $\{M_j\}$ defined below. As before R is an arbitrary positive number and we require that $R/4 < b < R/2$.

Proposition 2.5. *Let*

$$M_j = \exp(a^j), \quad s_j := s_\nu(M_j) \tag{2.62}$$

where $s_\nu(\cdot)$ *is defined as in* (2.35) *and*

$$1 < a < \min(1 + \frac{\nu H_0}{2Q_0}, 2). \tag{2.63}$$

Put $u_j = U_{M_j}$*. Then there exists* $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that*

$$\int_{\Omega_{b/2}} (|\nabla_x u_j|^2 + h(x) u_j^{q+1}) dx \le C_1(b) M_{j_0}^{q+1} \quad \forall j > j_0 \tag{2.64}$$

where $C_1(b) = cb^N \bar{h}(8b)$*.*

Proof. By (2.62) and (2.35),

$$a^j \nu / Q_0 = \mu(s_j). \tag{2.65}$$

Let j_0 be a positive integer to be determined later on. For each integer $j \ge j_0$ we define the set of pairs

$$\{b_{i,j}, \tau^{i,j} : i = j_0, \dots, j\}$$

by induction as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\tau^{j,j} = \tau_{b,\nu}(M_j, M_j), \quad b_{j,j} = b - \tau^{j,j}, \\ &\tau^{i,j} = \tau_{b_{i+1,j},\nu}(M_i, M_j), \quad b_{i,j} = b_{i+1,j} - \tau^{i,j}, \quad j_0 \le i < j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$b_{i,j} = b - \sum_{k=i}^{j} \tau^{k,j}, \quad j_0 \le i < j.$$

We show below that if j_0 is sufficiently large then

$$\sum_{i=j_0}^{j} \tau^{i,j} < b/2 \qquad \forall j > j_0, \tag{2.66}$$

which implies,

$$b/2 < b_{i,j}.$$

Specifically we choose j_0 so that,

$$\begin{aligned} &(i) \quad C_4(b/2) \le M_{j_0}^{(q+1)/2a} \\ &(ii) \quad \exp\Big(\frac{Q_0}{\nu}\mu(s^*)\Big) \le M_{j_0}, \\ &(iii) \quad C_5(b) := c_1 \frac{C_1(b) + C_3(b)}{C_2(b)} \le M_{j_0}^{q+1} \end{aligned} \tag{2.67}$$

with c_1 as in (2.57). For the definition of $C_1(b), \dots, C_4(b)$ see (2.3), (2.25), (2.40) and (2.51).

We observe that $C_4(b)$ decreases as b increases. Therefore (assuming (2.66)) condition (i) implies,

$$C_4(b_{i,j}) \le M_i^{(q+1)/2a}, \quad j_0 \le i \le j, \quad j_0 \le j. \tag{2.68}$$

The left hand side in condition (2.67)(iii) increases as b increases. Therefore

$$C_5(b_{i,j}) \le (q+1) \ln M_i, \quad j_0 \le i \le j, \quad j_0 \le j. \tag{2.69}$$

Put $u_j = U_{M_j}$. Assuming that (2.66) holds, we apply Proposition 2.4 to the case where b is replaced by $b_{j_0+1,j}$ and $M' = M_{j_0+1}$, $M = M_j$; we obtain,

$$\int_{\Omega_{b_{j_0,j}}} (|\nabla_x u_j|^2 + h(x)u_j^{q+1})dx \leq C_1(b)M_{j_0}^{q+1} \tag{2.70}$$

which implies (2.64).

It remains to verify (2.66). To this end we prove the following estimate:

$$\tau^{i,j} \leq \bar{c}Q_0(q+1)\frac{\omega(s_i)}{\nu}, \quad j_0 \leq i \leq j \tag{2.71}$$

where $\bar{c} = 4c$ (c as in (2.57)).

The proof is by induction. We apply Lemma 2.4 in the case where

$$b \text{ is replaced by } b_{i+1,j}, \quad M' = M_i, \quad M = M_j, \quad j_0 \leq i \leq j.$$

For $i = j$ we put $b_{j+1,j} := b$. Note that, for $M \geq M_{j_0}$, condition (2.67)(ii) yields (2.56).

Applying Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.1 to the case $i = j$ we obtain

$$\exp\frac{\tau^{j,j}}{2cs_j} \leq C_5(b)M_j^{q+1-\nu\frac{H_0}{Q_0}}.$$

Consequently, using (2.62) and condition (2.67)(iii)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\tau^{j,j}}{2cs_j} &\leq \ln C_5(b) + \big(q+1-\nu\frac{H_0}{Q_0}\big)\ln M_j \\ &\leq 2(q+1)\frac{Q_0\mu(s_j)}{\nu}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.72}$$

For the last inequality recall that $s_j = s_\nu(M_j)$, which implies,

$$\ln M_j = \frac{Q_0\mu(s_j)}{\nu}.$$

Inequality (2.72) implies (2.71) for $i = j$.

Observe that $s_j \downarrow 0$ as $j \uparrow \infty$ and consequently, $\omega(s_j) \downarrow 0$. Therefore if j_0 is sufficiently large we have $\tau^{j,j} < b/2$ and $b_{j,j} > b/2$. By Proposition 2.4,

$$I_{b_{j,j}}(M_j) \leq C_1(b_{j,j})M_j^{(q+1)/a} \leq C_1(b)M_{j-1}^{q+1}. \tag{2.73}$$

Here we use condition (2.67)(i) and the fact that $b_{j,j} = b - \tau_{b,\nu}(M_j, M_j)$.

Now we apply Lemma 2.4 for $i = j-1$, i.e., when b is replaced by $b_{j,j}$ and $M' = M_{j-1}$, $M = M_j$. This lemma, combined with (2.73), yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\exp\frac{\tau^{j-1,j}}{2cs_{j-1}} \leq \\ &c_1\Big(I_{b_{j,j}}(M_j) + C_3(b_{j,j})M_j^2M_{j-1}^{q-1}\Big)C_2(b_{j,j})^{-1}M_{j-1}^{-\nu\frac{H_0}{Q_0}} \leq \\ &c_1\Big(C_1(b_{j,j})M_{j-1}^{q+1} + C_3(b_{j,j})M_j^2M_{j-1}^{q-1}\Big)C_2(b_{j,j})^{-1}M_{j-1}^{-\nu\frac{H_0}{Q_0}}.\end{aligned}$$

By (2.63),

$$M_j^2 M_{j-1}^{-\nu\frac{H_0}{Q_0}} \leq M_{j-1}^2. \tag{2.74}$$

Therefore, similarly to (2.72), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\tau^{j-1,j}}{2cs_{j-1}} &\leq \ln C_5(b_{j,j}) + (q+1)\ln M_{j-1} \\ &\leq 2(q+1)\frac{Q_0\mu(s_{j-1})}{\nu},\end{aligned} \tag{2.75}$$

which, in turn, implies (2.71) for $i = j-1$.

This process can be repeated inductively for $i = j-2, j-3, \dots, j_0$ provided that $b_{i+1,j} \geq b/2$. For each value of i in this range we first apply Proposition 2.4 to obtain,

$$I_{b_{i+1,j}}(M_j) \leq C_1(b_{i+1,j})M_{i+1}^{(q+1)/a} \leq C_1(b)M_i^{q+1}. \tag{2.76}$$

After that we apply Lemma 2.4 combined with (2.76) to obtain (2.71) for the respective value of i, always with the same constant $\bar{c}$. Therefore, to complete the proof, it remains to be shown that there exists j_0 such that:

If $j > j_0$, $j_0 \leq k < j$ and $\tau^{i,j}$ satisfies (2.71) *for $k \leq i \leq j$ then,*

$$\sum_{i=k}^{j} \tau^{i,j} < b/2. \tag{2.77}$$

By (2.65) and (1.4)

$$s_i \leq (Q_0/\nu)a^{-i}\omega(s_i) \leq \ell a^{-i}, \quad \ell := Q_0\omega(s_0)/\nu.$$

Since, by assumption, (2.71) holds for $k \leq i \leq j$,

$$\sum_{i=k}^{j} \tau_{i,j} \leq C(N,q,\nu)\sum_{i=k}^{j}\omega(s_i) \leq C(N,q,\nu)\sum_{i=k}^{j}\omega(\ell a^{-i})$$

Further, using the monotonicity of ω,

$$\sum_{i=k}^{j}\omega(\ell a^{-i}) \leq \int_k^j \omega(\ell a^{-s})ds < \int_0^{\beta_k}\frac{\omega(r)}{r}dr$$

where $\beta_k = \ell a^{-k}$. Because of the Dini condition, the last integral tends to zero when $\beta_k \to 0$. Therefore, if j_0 is sufficiently large (depending only on N, q, ν and a) (2.77) holds for all $k \geq j_0$. □

Completion of proof of Theorem 2.1. Since U_M increases as M increases

$$U^R := \lim_{M\to\infty} U_M = \lim_{j\to\infty} u_j.$$

The function V_M defined by

$$V_M(x) = U_M(x', x_N + R)$$

is a solution of (1.1) in the ball $B_R(x^R)$ where $x^R = (0, R)$. If v is a solution of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$ then

$$v \le V^R := \lim_{M\to\infty} V_M \quad \text{in } B_R(x^R).$$

It remains to prove that V^R is bounded in a neighborhood of the point $(0, R)$ which is equivalent to U^R being bounded in a neighborhood of the origin.

By interior elliptic estimates, (2.64) implies that

$$\sup_{j_0\le j} \int_{\Omega_{b/3}} |u_j|^2 dx < \infty. \tag{2.78}$$

Since $h(x) \ge 0$, u_j is subharmonic in Ω_b. Therefore (2.78) implies

$$\sup\{u_j(x) : j_0 \le j,\ x \in \Omega_{b/4}\} < \infty. \tag{2.79}$$

□

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Put

$$r_j := 2^{-j}, \qquad \Omega_j = \{(x', x_N) : |x'| < r_j,\ 0 < x_N\}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots .$$

Further denote,

$$a_j := \exp\big(-\mu(r_j)\big), \quad A_j = \big(a_j r_j^2\big)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} \tag{3.1}$$

and, for $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$,

$$\gamma_j(x') = \begin{cases} A_j^{-1}\phi_1(x'/r_{j+1}) & \text{if } |x'| < r_{j+1} \\ 0 & \text{if } |x'| \ge r_{j+1} \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

where ϕ_1 the first eigenfunction of the Dirichlet problem to $-\Delta_{y'}$ in B_1^{N-1} normalized by $\phi_1(0) = 1$. Recall that $\mu(s) = \omega(s)/s$.

We consider the boundary value problems

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u_j + a_j u_j^q &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega_j, \\ u_j(x) &= 0 && \text{on } \{x \in \partial\Omega_j : x_N > 0\}, \\ u_j(x', 0) &= \gamma_j(x') && \text{for } |x'| \le r_j. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

In view of (1.4), $\{a_j\}$ is a decreasing sequence converging to zero and

$$a_j = \sup_{s\in(0,r_j)} \exp\big(-\mu(s)\big).$$

Therefore, for every $x_N > 0$, $\{u_j(0, x_N\}$ is an increasing sequence and u_j is a subsolution of the problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w + h(x)w^q &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega_j, \\ w(x) &= 0 && \text{on } \{x \in \partial\Omega_j : x_N > 0\}, \\ w(x', 0) &= \gamma_j(x') && \text{for } |x'| \le r_j. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on the following:

Proposition 3.1. *For every* $x_N > 0$,

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} u_j(0,x_N) = \infty.$$

In the next lemma we collect several results of Brada [2] that are used in the proof of this proposition.

Lemma 3.1. *Let* a *be a positive number, let* $q > 1$ *and let* f *be a positive function in* $L^\infty(B_1^{N-1})$, *where* B_1^{N-1} *denotes the unit ball in* $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ *centered at the origin.*

Consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u + b\,u^q &= 0 && \text{in } D_0\\ u(y) &= 0 && \text{for } y \in \partial D_0 \,:\, 0 < y_N, \\ u(y',0) &= f(y') && \text{for } |y'| \le 1, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$D_0 = \{y = (y', y_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N : |y'| < 1,\ 0 < y_N\}.$$

If u *is the solution of this problem then there exists a number* $\alpha > 0$ *such that*

$$\lim_{y_N\to\infty} \exp\big(\sqrt{\lambda_1} y_N\big) u(y) = \alpha\phi_1(y') \tag{3.6}$$

uniformly in B_1^{N-1}. *Here* λ_1 *is the first eigenvalue and* ϕ_1 *the corresponding eigenfunction of* $-\Delta_{y'}$ *in* B_1^{N-1} *normalized by* $\phi_1(0) = 1$.

The limit α *satisfies*

$$\alpha \le c b^{-\frac{1}{q-1}} \sup f. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. By [2, Theorem 4], (3.6) holds for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Under our assumptions u is positive so that $\alpha \ge 0$. By the remark in [2, p.357], if $\alpha = 0$ then there exists $k > 1$ such that

$$\lim_{y_N\to\infty} \exp\big(\sqrt{\lambda_k} y_N\big) u(y) = \phi_k(y')$$

where ϕ_k an eigenfunction of $-\Delta_{y'}$ in B_1^{N-1} corresponding to the k-th eigenvalue. However this is impossible because ϕ_k changes signs. Thus $\alpha > 0$.

Inequality (3.7) is a consequence of [2, Proposition 1]. □

3.1. **An estimate of u_j.** We start by rescaling problem (3.3). Put

$$y = x/r_j, \quad \tilde{u}_j(y) = A_j u_j(r_j y), \tag{3.8}$$

where A_j is given by (3.1). Then $v := \tilde{u}_j$ is the solution of the problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta v + v^q &= 0 && \text{in } D_0,\\ v(y) &= 0 && \text{for } y \in \partial D_0 \,:\, 0 < y_N, \\ v(y',0) &= \tilde{\gamma}(y') && \text{for } |y'| \le 1, \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\tilde{\gamma}(y') := \begin{cases} \phi_1(2y') & \text{if } |y'| < \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

Applying Lemma 3.1 to the solution v of (3.9) we obtain,

$$\lim_{y_N \to \infty} \exp(\sqrt{\lambda_1} y_N) v(y', y_N) = \alpha \phi_1(y') \tag{3.11}$$

where α is a positive number depending only on q, N. Consequently there exists $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\alpha\phi_1(y')\exp(-\sqrt{\lambda_1}y_N) &\le A_j u_j(r_j y) \\ &\le 2\alpha\phi_1(y')\exp(-\sqrt{\lambda_1}y_N) \quad \forall y_N \ge \beta,\ |y'| \le 1. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\alpha}{2A_j}\phi_1(x'/r_j)\exp(-\sqrt{\lambda_1}x_N/r_j) \le u_j(x) \\ &\le \frac{2\alpha}{A_j}\phi_1(x'/r_j)\exp(-\sqrt{\lambda_1}x_N/r_j) \quad \forall x_N \ge \beta r_j, \quad |x'| \le r_j. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

3.2. **Comparison of u_j and u_{j-1}.** Let τ_j be the number determined by the equation,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha}{2}\exp(-\sqrt{\lambda_1}\tau_j/r_j) =& \Big(\frac{a_j}{a_{j-1}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} 2^{-\frac{2}{q-1}} \\ =& 2^{-\frac{2}{q-1}} \exp\frac{-\mu(r_j) + \mu(r_{j-1})}{q-1} \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

By (3.1) and (3.2), this is equivalent to

$$\frac{\alpha}{2A_j}\phi_1(x'/r_j)\exp\Big(-\sqrt{\lambda_1}\frac{\tau_j}{r_j}\Big) = \gamma_{j-1}(x'). \tag{3.14}$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that (1.8) holds for $a = 2$. Therefore there exists $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\mu(r_j) - \mu(r_{j-1}) \ge \kappa\mu(r_j). \tag{3.15}$$

By (3.13),

$$\sqrt{\lambda_1}\frac{\tau_j}{r_j} = \frac{\mu(r_j) - \mu(r_{j-1})}{q-1} + c(N, q).$$

Therefore, by (3.15) and (1.4), there exist positive numbers c_0, c_1 and j_0 (depending only on κ, N, q) such that

$$\beta r_j < c_0\omega(r_j) \le \tau_j \le c_1\omega(r_j) \tag{3.16}$$

for every $j \ge j_0$ (β as in (3.12)).

By (3.12), (3.14) and (3.16)

$$\gamma_{j-1}(x') \le u_j(x', \tau_j), \quad |x'| \le r_j,\ j \ge j_0. \tag{3.17}$$

By the maximum principle, (3.3), (3.17) and the fact that $a_{j-1} > a_j$ imply

$$u_{j-1}(x', x_N) \le u_j(x', x_N + \tau_j) \quad \forall j \ge j_0,\ x \in \Omega_j. \tag{3.18}$$

3.3. **Proof of Proposition 3.1.** Let $j_0 \le k < m$. Iterating inequality (3.18) for $j = k+1, \dots, m$ we obtain,

$$u_k(x', x_N) \le u_m(x', x_N + \sum_{j=k+1}^{m} \tau_j) \quad \forall x \in \Omega_m. \tag{3.19}$$

Combining this inequality (for $x' = x_N = 0$) with (3.12) yields

$$\frac{1}{2}\alpha(a_k r_k^2)^{-\frac{1}{q-1}} = \frac{\alpha}{2A_k} \le u_k(0) \le u_m(0, \sum_{j=k+1}^{m} \tau_j) \tag{3.20}$$

for every m, k such that $j_0 \le k < m$. By (1.10),

$$\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \omega(r_j) = \infty.$$

Therefore, by (3.16)

$$\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \tau_j = \infty. \tag{3.21}$$

Consequently,

$$s_{m,k} := \sum_{j=k+1}^{m} \tau_j \implies \lim_{m\to\infty} s_{m,k} = \infty. \tag{3.22}$$

Note that $a_k r_k^2 \to 0$; therefore, by (3.20), for every $M > 0$ there exists j_M such that

$$M < u_m(0, s_{m,k}) \quad j_M \le k < m. \tag{3.23}$$

We claim that

$$\sup u_j(0, x_N) = \infty \quad \forall x_N > 0. \tag{3.24}$$

By negation, assume that

$$\exists s > 0 \,:\, \sup u_j(0, s) = K < \infty.$$

By (3.12)

$$\frac{u_j(x', s)}{u_j(0, s)} \le 4\alpha \quad |x'| \le r_j.$$

Here we use the fact that $1 = \phi(0) = \max \phi$. It follows that, for every j such that $2^j > \beta/s$,

$$\sup u_j(x', s) \le 4\alpha K, \quad |x'| \le r_j.$$

Therefore, by the maximum principle, for every j as above,

$$u_j(x', x_N) \le 4\alpha K \quad \forall x \in \Omega_j \cap [x_N \ge s].$$

In view of (3.22), this contradicts (3.23). □

3.4. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.**

Let $P_0(x,y) = c_N x_N |x-y|^{-N}$ be the Poisson kernel for $-\Delta$ in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$. Condition (1.9) implies that, for any positive constants a, R

$$\sup_{|x'|<R} |x'|^{-a} h(x) < \infty. \tag{3.25}$$

For every $q>1$ choose $a>0$ such that $q<(N+1+a)/(N-1)$. Then for every $R>0$,

$$\int_{[|x|<R,\,0<x_N]} h(x)P_0^q(x,0))x_N dx < C_a \int_{[|x|<R,\,0<x_N]} |x|^a P_0^q(x,0))x_N dx < \infty.$$

Consequently, for every $k>0$, the problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta v + h(x)v^q &= 0 && \text{in } D_0,\\ v &= 0 && \text{on } \partial_\ell D_0 := [|x'|=1,\ x_N>0],\\ v &= k\delta_0 && \text{on } [x_N=0] \end{aligned}$$

possesses a unique solution dominated by the supersolution kP_0 (see [4]).

The function

$$v_{0,\infty} := \lim_{k\to\infty} v_{0,k} \quad \text{in } D_0 \tag{3.26}$$

is a solution of (1.1) in $D_0 \cap [|x'|>0]$ but it may blow up as $|x'|\to 0$.

Put

$$f(x_N) = \int_{|x'|<1} v_{0,\infty}(x', \bar{x}_N)dx' \quad \forall x_N > 0.$$

If $f(a)<\infty$ for some $a>0$ then $v_{0,\infty}$ is finite in $D_0\cap[x_N>a]$ so that $f(x_N)<\infty$ for every $x_N>a$. Thus

$$f(a)<\infty \text{ for some } a>0 \implies f(x_N)<\infty \quad \forall x_N \geq a. \tag{3.27}$$

Let

$$b = inf\{x_N>0 : f(x_N)<\infty\}. \tag{3.28}$$

By(3.27)

$$f(x_N)=\infty \quad \forall x_N\in(0,b), \qquad f(x_N)<\infty \quad \forall x_N\in(b,\infty). \tag{3.29}$$

We have to show that $b=\infty$. By negation assume that $b<\infty$. First consider the case $0<b$. Let $a\in(0,b)$ and put $\eta(x');=v_{0,\infty}(x',a)$. Then

$$\int_{|x'|<1} \varphi\eta\, dx' = \infty \quad \forall\varphi\in C([|x'|\leq 1] \quad \text{such that } \varphi(0)>0.$$

Thus the measure $\mu_\eta = \eta\, dx'$ is larger then $k\delta_0$ for every $k>0$. The function V given by $V(x)=v_{0,\infty}(x', x_N+a)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta V + h(x)V^q &= 0 && \text{in } D_0,\\ V &= 0 && \text{on } \partial_\ell D_0 := [|x'|=1,\ x_N>0],\\ V &= \eta && \text{on } [x_N=0]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $V \geq v_{0,\infty}$, i.e.,

$$v_{0,\infty}(x', x_N + a) \geq v_{0,\infty}(x', x_N).$$

But this implies

$$f(x_N + a) = \infty \quad \forall x_N \in (0, a + b)$$

which contradicts (3.28).

Next assume that $b = 0$. In this case,

$$v_{0,\infty}(0, x_N) < \infty \quad \forall x_N > 0 \tag{3.30}$$

and consequently $v_{0,\infty}$ is a solution of (1.1) in D_0. Let w_j be the unique solution of the boundary value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w_j + a_j w_j^q &= 0, && \text{in } \Omega_j \\ w_j &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega_j \cap [x_N > 0], \\ w_j &= \infty\delta_0 && \text{on } [x_N = 0]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

where $a_j = h(r_j)$. As usual, this means that $w_j = \lim_{k\to\infty} w_{j,k}$ where $w_{j,k}$ is the solution of the modified problem where the boundary data on $x_N = 0$ is $w_{j,k}(x', 0) = k\delta_0$. Since $a_j \geq h(x)$ in Ω_j it follows that

$$w_j \leq v_{0,\infty} \quad \text{in } \Omega_j. \tag{3.32}$$

The function w_j^* given by $w_j^*(x) := A_j w_j(r_j x)$ for $x \in D_0$ is a solution of the problem:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w + w^q &= 0 && \text{in } D_0 \\ w &= 0 && \text{on } \partial_\ell D_0, \\ w(x', 0) &= \infty\delta_0 && \text{on } [x_N = 0]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

The solution of this problem is unique; consequently w_j^* is independent of j and we denote it by w^*.

Let $C := \sup_{|x'|<1/2} w^*(x', 1)$. Then $w_j(y) = A_j^{-1} w^*(y/r_j)$ satisfies

$$w_j(y', r_j) \geq c A_j^{-1}, \quad |y'| < r_{j+1}.$$

As $\gamma_j(x') = 0$ for $|x'| > r_{j+1}$ it follows that

$$w_j(y', r_j) \geq c\gamma_j(x'), \quad |x'| < r_j.$$

Hence

$$w_j(x', x_N + r_j) \geq u_j(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega_j.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 3.1,

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} w_j(0, x_N) = \infty \quad \forall x_N > 0.$$

Hence, by (3.32),

$$v_{0,\infty}(0, x_N) = \infty \quad \forall x_N > 0$$

in contradiction to (3.30).

□

References

[1] Bandle C. and Marcus M., *Asymptotic behavior of solutions and their derivatives, for semilinear, elliptic problems with blowup at the boundary,* Ann. Inst. H. Poincare, v. 12 (1995), p.155-171.

[2] Brada A., *Comportement asymptotique de solutions d'équations elliptiques semi-linéares dans un cylindre,* Asymptotic An. v. 10 (1995), p. 335-366.

[3] Keller J. B., *On solutions of $\Delta u = f(u)$,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math., v. 10 (1957), 503-510.

[4] Marcus M. and Véron L., *The boundary trace of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations: The subcritical case,* Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., v. 144 (1998), p. 201-231.

[5] Marcus M. and Véron L., *Initial trace of positive solutions to semilinear parabolic inequalities,* Adv. Nonlinear Studies, v.2 (2002) p.395-436.

[6] Marcus M. and Véron L., *Boundary Trace of Positive Solutions of Nonlinear Elliptic Inequalities,* Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa, V. III (2004) p.481-533.

[7] Osserman R., *On the inequality $\Delta u \geq f(u)$,* Pacific J. Math., v. 7 (1957) pp. 1641-1647.

[8] Shishkov A. and Véron L., *The balance between diffusion and absorption in semilinear parabolic equations,* Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl., v. 18 (2007), 5996.

[9] Shishkov A. and Véron L., *Diffusion versus absorption in semilinear elliptic equations,* J. Math. Anal. Appl., v. 352 (2009) 206217.

[10] Shishkov A. and Véron L., *Singular solutions of some nonlinear parabolic equations with spatially inhomogeneous absorption,* Calc. Var. P. D. E., v. 33 (2008) 343-375.

Department of Mathematics, Technion Haifa, ISRAEL
E-mail address: `marcusm@math.technion.ac.il`

Institute of Appl. Math. and Mech., NAS of Ukraine, Donetsk, Ukraine
E-mail address: `shishkov@iamm.ac.donetsk.ua`